22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION
11	Lucy A POLLO CROUD INC
12	In re APOLLO GROUP, INC. SECURITIES LITIGATION) Case No.: C 06-80270 MISC PVT)
13 14 15 16 15 16 17 17 17 17 17 17 17) ORDER RE DEPOSITIONS OF NON- PARTIES JULIE ALBERTSON AND MARY HENDOW
5 515	
16	On August 29, 2006, non-parties Julie Albertson and Mary Hendow ("Movants") filed an
15117	application to shorten time for hearing on a motion to quash deposition subpoenas. ¹ On September
18	13, 2006, this matter was referred and reassigned to Magistrate Judge Patricia V. Trumbull.
19	Pursuant to instructions from this court, on September 18, 2006 the parties and Movants filed briefs
20	stating their respective positions as to whether this court should stay the depositions pending hearing
21	of the motion to quash. The court requested this briefing because from the moving papers it

Case 5:06-mc-80270-PVT Document 13 Filed 09/18/06 Page 1 of 2

appeared there was a potential dispute regarding whether the Movants would be subject to being deposed a second time if this court does not quash the subpoenas as to the document requests. Based on the briefs and arguments presented,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the depositions shall go forward as currently scheduled on September 19 and 20, 2006. Given the firm deadline the trial judge has set for exchange of expert witnesses, and in light of the fact the Movants did not initially request a stay of the depositions, the

The holding of this court is limited to the facts and the particular circumstances underlying the present motion.

court finds delay of the depositions is not warranted. Moreover, upon further review of the Defendant's deposition subpoenas, it appears that many categories of documents requested are for copies of documents within the possession of Defendant's subsidiary, University of Phoenix, and thus are already available for Defendant to use at the deposition. Only the production of documents that are not currently available to Defendant will warrant reopening the depositions, and any such follow-up depositions will be strictly limited to such documents.

Dated: 9/18/06

For the Northern District of California 8 2 2 9 2 8

PATRICIA V. TRUMBULL United States Magistrate Judge